

**Prepared Remarks by U.S. Attorney Preet Bharara
Kentucky Legislative Ethics Commission
January 6, 2016**

It is an honor to be here and to address you. It is special for a lot of reasons, one of which is, as you might imagine, something like this has always been on my bucket list. So I am glad that I have had the chance to check it off – to be in roomful of politicians who are required to be here. While I still have subpoena power. So I thank you for that.

In reality I can advise all of you that you are not being wiretapped – at this moment – at least not by my office.

Seriously, I want to thank all of you for the invitation and for the honor of inviting me here and also for your service to the people of Kentucky. I have the deepest respect and even reverence for what legislative bodies are, for what they can do, and for what they can be.

For a time, as John mentioned in the introduction, I served as a staff member in the United States Senate for four-and-a-half years – where we did everything we could to exercise our constitutional mandate of advise and consent, and our popular mandate to oversee the executive branch, which we did, vigorously, to make sure that we hold the executive branch accountable which is not always seen.

I am very proud of the work I did there. And I am very proud of the people I met. I am proud of the people for whom I served. I am proud of the friendships I made there on both sides of the aisle. So I think I have some understanding of what it means to serve in a legislative body, a point that is sometimes forgotten by some folks in my home state.

I understand that you had a convicted former state legislator speak last year at this conference. Might I suggest, if you are running out of speakers in the future that a fertile source of future speakers is my own state. If you were to invite a convicted New York legislator every year, you'd be set for over a decade – my office alone has charged, as John mentioned, 12 state legislators, and convicted 11 of them. Lest you feel bad for us, the one that got away was shortly convicted later by my sister district in the Eastern District of New York.

Now, it is not for me, despite the warm welcome, to lecture a roomful of elected leaders – a subpoena-wielding prosecutor from up north. You know your oath. You know your duty. You know your privileged position.

I just have a fairly simple point to make this morning. And it is this: If you want to prevent corruption, don't enable it. If you want to deter corrupt members, don't become their willing accomplices.

Before I am a prosecutor, I am an American, and a New Yorker. I love New York with all my heart, just like all of you love Kentucky. But what has been going on in New York government of late is simultaneously heartbreaking, head-scratching, and comic.

Legislative session began this very morning in Albany at the time of the most serious corruption crisis in modern New York history; this is a moment that calls for more than talk. Because there has been a lot of enabling of corruption up there. I hate to say it, but it's true. More on that in a few minutes and on the relevance of that for you folks.

Now, I don't pretend to know what is good for Kentucky, in the particulars. And I don't opine on specific statutory reform language in New York. The biggest problem of all from where I sit, not just in New York but in other places, but I know about New York, is the seeming lack of will to do anything at all.

So what I thought I would do this morning is give you some background and tell some stories to illustrate just this simple point: Every single one of you is responsible for the institution that you have proud membership in.

It is not just the corrupt actors who bear responsibility, but every enabler too.

One of the greatest Americans – to my mind perhaps the greatest American of the 20th century – was Teddy Roosevelt. And he began his brilliant career how? As a New York State Assemblyman, at age 23. The youngest in New York history.

He once said this: “No man who is corrupt, no man who condones corruption in others, can possibly do his duty by the community.”

Now there has been, sadly, a lot of condoning in my home state. That doesn't mean that everyone is a criminal. Most are not. But it does mean that everyone has some responsibility.

I have been criticized by some of your counterparts in my home state for putting the statehouse in a bad light. You know who put Albany in a bad light? Albany. It's kind of like blaming firefighters for the fire, and I will come back to this point at the end of my remarks.

So in this vein, I thought I would talk a bit about the landscape in New York – where it continues to seem that the best way to find Albany on a map is at the intersection of greed and ambition. I will talk a bit about some observations from our season of prosecutions – and maybe there are some lessons to be learned; maybe there are some notes of caution that might be relevant as you think about your own duties going forward.

I have a motto in my Office: Let's learn from *other* people's mistakes, other prosecutor's mistakes. It is a lot better to learn from other people's mistakes than to have to make your own and learn that way. So when we see a prosecution or an investigation that has problem somewhere else, we have a meeting about it. We talk about it and that is how we educate ourselves. That's why I offer some of these stories about New York in that vein. Maybe there is something to be learned about, not just in my home state, but for you fine folks here in Kentucky also.

I have high praise for this commission from what I know of it – and for the Executive Director John Schaaf. He picked me up from the airport yesterday very kindly and we had a conversation

about how he thinks about this and the fact that he invites the kind of people that he has invited and encourages thinking about how other people got into trouble and how you folks can avoid that too. It is clear to me from my brief time knowing John that he cares a lot about the institution. He cares a lot about you, and about protecting you and the institution. So you are lucky to have him and this commission here in Kentucky.

Now, I know Kentucky is not perfect. No state is. I have been reading some things, but what appears to be true, is that Kentucky is doing a better job in its legislature than New York is when it comes to integrity. Much better.

If the letter that I received inviting me to come speak here is to be believed, it says: "Since the 1993 adoption of the Code, no Kentucky legislator has been indicted for misusing his or her public office."

In this regard, as has already been mentioned, the tale of the tape works out badly for New York.

Indeed, from what I can tell the New York of the past few years is a little bit like the Kentucky of the early 90's, when I think ten Kentucky state legislators and lobbyist were arrested in a federal probe. Now in some ways the large group of New York officials that have been arrested and convicted is even worse. Because I understand in the early '90s in the Kentucky federal investigation and prosecutions arose from the same case, in the same scheme. In New York, we have seen a dozen people put in prison, mostly in separate schemes which says something about the pervasiveness of corruption, unfortunately, in my state.

Now, to be sure – and this never gets quoted in New York when I talk about corruption – there are countless honorable and ethical people serving in elected office in the New York state legislature and every other political body in the country – people who believe that representing ordinary Americans is a high calling, a calling to improve one's community and one's country in some small measure.

But that said, in recent times, the New York legislature has been marked by regular bribery, rampant kickbacks, and rancid culture. Recent events paint a portrait of a show-me-the-money culture, in the worst possible way. It continues to be a bipartisan affair – Republican and Democrat; in the Assembly and in the Senate; upstate and downstate.

Here's how the public is reacting: A recent Quinnipiac poll found that 87 percent of New Yorkers believe that corruption in the state is a "somewhat serious" or "very serious" problem. 87 percent.

How are they reacting to what the prosecutors are doing about it? Another Quinnipiac poll from just this past fall reported that 41 percent of New Yorkers said that I had not gone far enough in investigating corruption in state government, while just 4 percent said that my office had gone too far. Four percent!

I think more people think the earth is flat. More people think the moon landing is a hoax. Four percent is basically a margin of error. And it speaks volumes about how frustrated people are about how the legislature is doing.

Let me give you some examples of cases – none of which I have made up. We prosecuted a case in New York not long ago, where a state legislator, Eric Stevenson, not only corruptly helped businessmen obtain necessary permits for adult day care centers, but also – in exchange for cash bribes – introduced actual legislation barring the opening of competing adult day care centers in New York City. In other words, Stevenson tried to enact a statutory moratorium to give his co-defendants a local monopoly. As I said at the time, it is a fairly neat trick to hatch a scheme that offends core principles of both democracy and capitalism, simultaneously. But we had that in New York recently.

In New York, after an eruption of corruption cases and convictions, the Governor actually established a full-blown anti-corruption commission, known as the Moreland Commission, complete with subpoena power and 25 commissioners. After only nine months – with the corruption problem far from solved and promised reports still unwritten – that commission was shuttered, giving new meaning to the phrase “open and shut case.” That also happened in New York.

Here’s what else we saw in New York – a state senator Tony Avella, testified that even though he is the Chair of the Ethics Committee, he has never been permitted to have a hearing, his committee has never marked up a bill. Imagine that, in the midst of the greatest public corruption extravaganza perhaps in the Statehouse’s history.

Here is my favorite: In New York, we famously had a senate counsel advise the members of that body to hand deliver their mandatory financial disclosure form – rather than put them in the mail. Why, you ask? To lessen the likelihood of a federal mail fraud charge. You almost can’t make this stuff up.

And it is not just prosecutors and editorial writers who have bemoaned the situation. You should hear what the legislators themselves have said – caught on wiretaps and body wires.

One Assemblyman said this, caught on tape, talking about his Albany colleagues: “Bottom line...if half of the people up here in Albany was ever caught for they do....they... would probably be [in jail], so who are they BS-ing?” So that’s just to giving you some sense of the background leading up to 2015.

Then, of course, in calendar year 2015, a corruption earthquake really hit New York. One year ago today, we had a long-serving assembly speaker, Sheldon Silver, and a long-serving senate majority leader, Dean Skelos. One a Democrat, the other a Republican, both with a firm grasp and grip on power in the State of New York, a state of almost 20 million people and a multi-billion dollar budget.

Both leaders were charged, in multiple counts, of federal corruption crimes. Both went to trial. Both were convicted, swiftly, on all counts, within 13 days of each other. That is unprecedented in New York and perhaps unprecedented in the country

These are awful and sad stories. No one says these men never did anything good for their community or for their state. But they threw it all away. They threw their liberty away – although sentencing is still pending – by forgetting that their jobs were not meant to be vehicles for massive personal profit, by forgetting that their oaths were not meant to be empty promises of honest service.

A couple of general points about these cases which may be of interest. Both were convicted of honest services fraud, which is of some relevance to you all, because it is the same federal law that applies everywhere and local U.S. attorneys here have the same access and entitlement to use those statutes.

If you attended the trials or reviewed any of the evidence, you would see how much of an overwhelming sense of entitlement pervaded both leaders' thinking and conduct – entitlement to money, entitlement to power.

I know prior speakers have come before you talked about this problem of entitlement and I think it bears repeating because sometimes people forget.

Something else was also interesting about those cases. People did not seem to understand that we did not need to prove an explicit quid pro quo – that's not how it works. That is not what is required under federal law. I'd like to spend a minute on that. The way it works – particularly with smart people, people who are smart enough to get elected in New York and elsewhere – is you don't have an overt discussion in an alley where a politician says, "you give me that bag of cash and do that and I will pass this bill for you...and can you please sign this document attesting to the bribe?" That is not how life works. That is not people commit public corruption crimes. There is no trail like that. That is not what is required to prove a quid pro quo, to prove a federal corruption crime anywhere in the country under federal law.

Here is the legal truth: Even if some small part of the motivation for taking an official act – and lots of things qualifies as an official act under federal law – was the money that would come from the very people benefiting from the official act, that's a quid pro quo. That's a crime. And we proved it overwhelmingly at two trials just last month.

A few other points about the law and the cases we proved. It does not matter by the way if the person for whom you perform the official action is a friend – if some of your motivation was the money. That was a ludicrous defense at the trial, and it was quickly rejected. Obviously in some ways doing an official act like that for a friend is worse. It does not matter if the official act performed happens to be good for the community – if some of your motivation is for the money.

It also does not matter if the official act performed is something you would have done anyway – if some of your motivation is the money, for what you were getting in return.

As one of my prosecutors, Tatiana Martins, said at the senate majority leader Dean Skelos trial: “for a corrupt politician, what could be better than pocketing a bribe for an action you were going to take anyway?”

A quick background on the Silver trial, he was the former assembly speaker. There were two schemes that we charged – in one case giving grants to a medical research center and another to take official action for a real estate company, in exchange for bribes and kickbacks disguised as referral fees through two law firms for whom he worked. He enriched himself to the tune of more than \$4 million, as proven at trial.

The evidence showed in connection with this honest services fraud case (because honest services was at the core) that he lied over and over and over again. He never disclosed one of his sources of income, though he was required to. He said that he never represented corporations. That was a lie. He said that he had never represented a client who had business before the state. Lie. He said that he represented little people and did actual legal work. That was a lie.

The truth is, as proved at trial, he doled out favors through official actions – legislation and the awarding of grant money quietly without any oversight whatsoever \$500,000 worth, because he was motivated by the money. And he got rich in the process.

The defense, by the way, in Speaker Silver’s case was interesting. Part of the defense was that the prosecutors in my office saw everything through dirty windows, that this was just ordinary politics and we were looking at it the wrong way. His lawyer actually said this in his opening statement: “They took conduct which is legal, which is normal, conduct which allows government to function consistent with the way that our founding fathers of the state of New York wanted it to function, and they say this is illegal.” He actually said that. The founding fathers –presumably Alexander Hamilton –believed in bribery.

Well, it turns out it wasn’t the windows that were dirty.

One problem with this defense, in part – and this is why it’s relevant to all the good people in this room – is that it maligned every honest fellow legislator. It lumped his criminal conduct with the honorable service of upstanding elected officials.

I can’t make that point any better than one of my prosecutors in my office, Andrew Goldstein, during summation, he said, “In response to all that evidence stacked so powerfully against him, the defense has claimed that Sheldon Silver was just practicing politics as usual. You must reject that. To taint your fellow legislators and the democratic process with your own corruption and say that what happened here is politics as usual? Not even close. Not by a mile. This is bribery. This is extortion. This is corruption. The real thing. Don’t let it stand. Don’t let it stand.” And they did not, quickly.

Dean Skelos, the long serving, Republican, State Senate Majority Leader in New York. Basically in that case we charged and then proved beyond a reasonable doubt in trial that he was a father who got no-show jobs and lots and lots of payments for his son, by the way well off, and grown son, through three different schemes.

We proved that the Senator repeatedly took official actions in return for payments to his son – sometimes asking for these jobs for his son at the same meetings where lobbyists were trying to get him to act favorably on legislation for him.

One quick story of something that we proved at trial, to give you a flavor of what can happen sometimes when people have unfettered power and a long time in office, when taken to an extreme, when you think it is okay to line your pockets or family member's pockets because you have the power to do so.

One of the jobs that Senator Skelos got for his son was at a company called PRI. Adam Skelos, the son, decided that he was not going to show up for work. Towards the beginning of his first or second week at that job, the son is called into the supervisor's office. The supervisor says, "You're supposed to show up for work – it's a job." And do you know what Adam Skelos said, what he was proven to have said at trial? He threatened to bash the man's skull in, and told him that he wasn't fit enough to shine his, Adam Skelos's, shoes. Then he called his dad and then his dad, Senator Skelos, the majority leader called his son's supervisor's own supervisor and said, "Make sure Adam continues to get paid." And he continued not to show up for work.

In fact, some of you may remember, a long serving United States Senator in New York, Alphonse D'Amato. Alphonse D'Amato testified at our trial. Probably the dean of the Republican Party in New York State. He found out that Senator Skelos had a son who had a no-show job in New York and made a personal visit to Senator Skelos home and said, "Fellow Republican, you have a problem. Your son is not showing up for his job. That's a problem." This is Alphonse D'Amato speaking to Dean Skelos. And Dean Skelos said Adam needs the job and didn't do anything about it. That was devastating proof at the trial.

The point of all of this is to think about how in the minds of some people over time something that might in a different line of work is a whole different ball of wax when you have the power that you have.

My personal favorite moment in the course of this case that shows you some of the hubris that was going on here. We were wiretapping some phone calls, as I mentioned. On one of them, and this is a recording played during trial. This is Adam Skelos talking to his father. By the way, it was proved during trial that Adam Skelos was concerned about the "feds" snooping around, so he got a burner phone; that is a phone that is not registered in your own name. On one occasion he was lamenting the fact it was hard to talk about things because there was "heat" from the "feds". And he literally says this to his father: "You can't talk normally because it's like f-ing Preet Bharara is listening to every f-ing phone call. It's just f-ing frustrating."

Well, we were listening to that call too. As it turns out.

I really can't improve on the work of the career prosecutors and criminal investigators in my Office, so I am quoting from them because they did the cases, they proved the cases and they made a lot of great points. I thought this analogy was one of the best I've ever heard. It may help you think about the power you have and think about how the actions you take are different

from the actions of ordinary citizens who don't have political power and are not sworn to uphold the constitution.

He said in his rebuttal statement at the trial of Dean Skelos, to explain this idea that you can be committing a crime without signing a contract about the bribe, without an explicit statement in writing quid pro quo. And he quoted from a children's book *Where the Sidewalk Ends* written by Shel Silverstein. And he says this in the rebuttal: "At the end of the book is a poem. On one side of the page there is an illustration of a kid, a little happy kid. And he's riding on top of this gigantic gorilla. The gorilla is huge. It's a giant. And the kid is on top of the gorilla...and he's smiling. He's happy. The gist of it is, and it's told from the kid's perspective, the gist of it is: Hey, ever since I started bringing my gorilla to school, kids, they're bringing me presents. My teachers are letting me chew gum in class. They're saying great job. I'm allowed to cheat on my tests. And I'm getting all A's – ever since I brought my gorilla to school. Now, why is everyone at school being so nice to the kid? . . . they're all afraid that the gorilla is going to rip their arms off and that's why he's getting A's on his tests and all of that. And they should be scared of this gorilla because it has no business being in a school."

And the gorilla in the Dean Skelos case – it was the power of the office of the Senate Majority Leader. The power to make or break businesses. The power to benefit people or take benefits away. When he and his son showed up with that gorilla, that power, they didn't need to make the explicit ask. Lobbyists and companies knew what they had to do, just like in the poem, no one had to say anything out loud. If you don't pay my son, I will use my power to punish you. No one had to say that.

Each of you has the power of the gorilla. Remember that because it bears remembering – need not be an explicit quid pro quo. You can wield power silently and effectively and you can get in trouble for it which is why I tell that story.

Now, those were the some of the bad guys, who have now proven to be bad guys – the notorious ones who are in jail or who need to start packing for jail.

But I want to get back to the main point. There will be bad apples. You will find them not just in a legislature. You may find them at a company; you may find them at a hedge fund; you may find them at a university; you may find them in a sports league. So this business about institutions and culture is not unique to politics or to political structures. It is the fundamental conundrum and challenge for all institutions since the beginning of time.

I mentioned Teddy Roosevelt earlier and his talk about condoning corruption. Let me put it another way. Among the things that I do, I don't just talk to Legislatures; I go and talk to students at business school all the time because we do a lot of white collar criminal work and Wall Street prosecution. And I say when I talk to these bright, young business students at some of the best business schools in the country, I am not here in the vein of some type of scared-straight program for white collar folks. Although it's a little bit of that.

It is not just to direct my words solely to the two or three of you who, statistically speaking, are likely to commit serious securities fraud in the future – although I know who you are.

Rather, my words are more importantly directed to the ears of the vast majority of people in that room, like this room, in every institution who are ethical, honest and honorable. And who want to do the right thing, but didn't do anything about when they saw bad things were going on down the hall, on another floor.

That is the problem for every institution. Every famous case involving an institution that our office or other offices have handled shows the same pattern – people knew. People knew – before the prosecutors showed up. Before the FBI showed up. People always know.

Whether you're talking about Bernard Madoff's firm, which we prosecuted; or the Galleon Group which we prosecuted; or with a scandal like the abuse at Penn State, which we were not involved with. People knew. And people did nothing. And a lot of pain and suffering and loss of reputation could have been saved in each and every one of those case– if the good people had just done something. If the good people had just sounded the alarm.

And so this is perhaps, from my perspective, is one of the most unfortunate things about the status quo in my home state. Most disheartening, perhaps, was the deafening silence of the many individuals who, over the time period covered by our investigations, saw something and said nothing. Who learned of suspicious and potentially criminal activity in the halls of the Capital and said nothing. No one made a call. No one blew the whistle. No one sounded the alarm. That is what one could call a pretty poor job of self-policing.

And so, that is the fundamental and critical question for you – being good people honorable legislators, ethical human beings – How will you react if you find corruption around you? If you see corruption in your midst? Will you look the other way? Will you plant your head in the sand? Will you follow your extreme short term political interest? Will you tolerate the intolerable?

Here's what happened in New York. Now, to be sure, there were brave and vocal souls in the legislator, as there often are, who inveigh against corruption, welcome scrutiny, and advocate reforms. Senator Liz Kruger for example sample said a lot of good and helpful things. But that was the minority, based on what I saw. After the charges were brought, there was an interesting mix of reactions from the legislature – many were in denial about the problem; dismissed the seriousness of the problem; and/or denigrated the prosecutors who were just doing their jobs.

Now of course there is an absolute presumption of innocence. That is the foundation of our criminal justice system. And it always has to be that way, but the presumption of innocence and proof beyond reasonable doubt is not what is required for an employer or for a legislator.

For a few days after Sheldon Silver was charged - by the way, he was charged in a very detailed 35-page complaint by my office which was approved by a federal magistrate judge who has to make a finding of probable cause that the crime was committed and committed by Sheldon Silver. And by the way, an office that has a conviction rate of close to 100 percent.

You wonder how a lot of Mr. Silver's colleagues reacted in the Assembly. I think it was fine for people to want to wait for Mr. Silver's day in court. But the question arose and this might arise in any legislature: During the pendency of that should he maintain his leadership position, notwithstanding the facts and context I just described to you?

When you work at a particular institution, it may be that there is a reflexive attitude about protecting your leader because you owe him or for some other reason. Or if you go after the leader you have to "kill" leader.

But just think about how this looked to the rest of the world and the rest of people in New York when if you were a police officer, or a precinct commander, the principal of a school, or a firefighter, and you had laid at your feet a 35-page detailed complaint, approved by a magistrate judge by an office with a reputation like ours, do you think that that person would have maintained his leadership position and not be fired?

You know that every day the hard working every day public servants and private sector in the face of that have to step aside. For days, in both cases, there were many that fought to keep their leaders in power, which is their right. I am only making the point as an observer, suggesting that it tells you something about the thinking then.

No employer is bound by the presumption of innocence. The standard for trusted leadership, I would think, should be something higher than – I have not yet been convicted of a crime. I mean, my goodness. No political leader is holy. And I apologize to the leaders who may or may not be in the room. As I said, there was also a lot of dismissive talk and denigration of the prosecutors who brought the case. Many, and you can read the pages of the papers of New York, spent more time in whispered whining about the prosecutors than acknowledging and solving the problem.

They said we didn't understand politics. That we don't like politics, which is a particularly strange criticism, given who the U.S. Attorney is, someone who served four-and-a-half years in the legislative body.

A man by the name of Errol Lewis wrote the following in the Daily News which tells you a little about culture which is relevant in the discussion here and how you do your jobs: "[S]everal liberal lawmakers embarrassed themselves by rushing to Silver's defense after a grand jury handed up the indictment. Assemblymen Dick Gottfried and David Weprin, you'll remember, both read the indictment and publicly concluded that the problem was . . . the prosecutor!"

Continuing: "'In my opinion, it seems to be a financial disclosure mistake,' said Weprin, apparently with a straight face. 'It's distressing that in this country you can end up in handcuffs based on these kinds of flimsy, unsubstantiated allegations,' sniffed Gottfried. Sounds like he didn't read the detailed 35-page criminal complaint and/or he is a lawmaker who doesn't understand the law."

People who think that public corruption prosecutors hate politics make no sense. That is like saying securities prosecutors hate people who trade in securities. What they don't like is

securities fraud. Or saying healthcare prosecutors don't like health care. They don't like is health care fraud. It is not politics that prosecutors don't like, like me and everywhere in country, it is corrupt politics. It is criminal politics.

And you know who else doesn't like it? The people who put the politicians in their jobs. They don't like it a single bit.

And so some of these politicians in my home state marginalized and infantilized by their leaders for so long, showed a total misunderstanding of our approach; of their own failings; and of the public's disgust.

There was an interesting tidbit in the Wall Street Journal about how there had been a recently elected member of the state assembly who had served as a federal prosecutor in my sister district, the Eastern District of New York. There were articles in the WSJ talking about how that guy who had served reputably and honorably as a prosecutor was viewed with great suspicion in the body. This was odd to me because I thought that being in law enforcement was a badge of honor, having done a good public service. That is how debauched the culture of Albany became – that they would denigrate this high form of public service and law enforcement speaks volumes of what the culture has become.

So, cleaning up public corruption – preventing public corruption – is ultimately not up to the local U.S. Attorney; it is up to the legislature itself. We can't do it alone. It takes leadership. And it will take leadership in my own state.

Looking the other way is not leadership.

Blaming the prosecutors is not leadership.

Kicking the can is not leadership.

Accepting lies and half-truths is not leadership.

Making excuses is not leadership.

Whining is not leadership.

These are simple points and I know that you know them. The simplest possible points. But sometimes the simplest points, I think, bear repeating. The institution that polices itself, that cares about policing itself, is the institution that gets – and deserves – respect. That is the institution that garners trust. That is the institution that attracts talent. That is the institution that rallies public support. That is the institution that gets things done. For whom? For the people.

In the end, this is not just only about your own personal ethics and integrity. It is about the ethics and integrity of the institution, about the idealism and reputation of the institution you serve.

About the respect and admiration of the people you serve. The people who put you here. It is about protecting that.

And I know you know this, but I thought that the perspective that I have seeing how sometimes this has been forgotten over and over again in New York might be worth sharing.

So I have prattled on long enough.

I thank you again and I am honored by the invitation. I wish you all good luck and thank you for your service.